

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/840,467

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the application.

Based on the Response filed September 2, 2003, the Examiner removed the previous claim rejection. The current status of the claims is the following.

Claims 1-7 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 09/840,023. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by newly-cited Sato (US 5,949,407). Claims 3-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of newly-cited Morrison (US 6,591,292). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections with the following comments.

With regard to the double patenting rejection, Applicant files herewith a terminal disclaimer, thereby overcoming the rejection.

Sato relates to a remote control system including a three-button remote controller adapted to control multiple devices. The remote control system displays operation pictures in one area of a display screen, such that the operation pictures do not obstruct a video image being displayed simultaneously on the display screen. The operation pictures are selected using the remote controller such that command codes corresponding to the selected operation picture are transmitted to the corresponding device to perform the controlling operation.

Morrison relates to method and interface for incorporating program information into an electronic message, and for receiving such program information by an electronic message and/or implementing, based on the received program information, a corresponding program.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/840,467

With regard to the anticipation rejection of the claims, Applicant submits that Sato fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 2 of the present invention. Specifically, Sato does not disclose an OSD source for transmitting a plurality of OSD multi cursor display data by giving each OSD multi cursor display data a peculiar ID and transmitting a selected OSD multi cursor ID and display location information in the case that there is an OSD multi cursor display command from said OSD source remote controller. The Examiner points to col. 7, lines 30-40 and col. 10, lines 52-61 as allegedly disclosing these features of the claim, but Applicant disagrees. In particular, the cited excerpts do not disclose the feature of an OSD source which gives each OSD multi cursor display data a peculiar ID. Sato is silent regarding this aspect of claim 2. Rather, Sato discloses pressing up and/or down buttons on a remote controller until a cursor has moved to a portion of the display desired by the user, at which time the enter button on the remote controller is pressed.

Further, Sato fails to disclose an OSD source which transmits a selected OSD multi cursor ID and display location information in the case that there is an OSD multi cursor display command from said OSD source remote controller. Instead, the user moves a cursor around a display until the cursor is in a desired location, at which time the enter button is pressed to select the desired item. When an item is selected, a command code for the selected item is transmitted. By contrast, Sato does not disclose transmitting a selected OSD multi cursor ID and display location information.

Therefore, claim 2 and its dependent claims 3-7 are not anticipated by Sato.

Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Sato for analogous reasons to those for claim 2.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U. S. Application No. 09/840,467

For the rejection of claims 3-7 over Sato in view of Morrison, Applicant submits that claims 3-7 are allowable, at least because of their dependence from claim 2 and because Morrison fails to make up for the above-described deficiencies of Sato.

With further regard to claim 3, Morrison does not disclose an OSD generator for generating OSD display data in bitmap format. The Examiner cites the system controller 115 as allegedly corresponding to the claimed OSD generator. However, Morrison is silent with regard to the system controller 115 generating OSD display data in bitmap format. Thus, claim 3 is allowable for this reason as well.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,


Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

Date: July 21, 2004